

L19 and E1 can be reproduced since their sequences are known. See, for example, table 2 of *Pini et al.*, Design and Use of a Phage Display Library, The Journal of Biological Chemistry, Vol. 273, No. 34, Issue of August 21, 1998, pp. 21769-21776. A copy of this reference is attached.

A check on the PAIR system indicates that the record contains the submitted reference; however, not scanned in independently under a separate properly labeled heading, but rather as pages 4-11 of "Applicant Arguments/Remarks Made in an Amendment."

The Second Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112, first paragraph

Claims 15-34 remain rejected. The Office Action states that "applicants show a structure at the top of page 2 of the response," and alleges that "it is not clear if this is the same compound as used in Example 1." Applicants clearly and explicitly stated in the third paragraph of the remarks in the last reply, which is immediately above the structure referred to above that

The Office Action requests the structure of the compound of example 1. The structure follows and clearly demonstrates that Y is $=C(CH_3)_2$ in said compound.

Thus, it is not understood why it is not clear that the depicted structure is the structure used in Example 1. Applicants clearly state that this structure is the structure of example 1, and the Office Action has provided no reasons as to why this statement is disregarded or disbelieved. Applicants now again confirm that the structure discussed-above is the structure of the compound of example 1.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Specification

The new matter issue raised regarding the specification is moot. The above-discussed structure clearly demonstrates that Y being $=C(CH_3)_2$ is not new matter.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The claims are rejected as allegedly obvious over Neri (Nature Biotechnology), in view of Viti, applicants' alleged admission in the specification, and Licha '485.

The claims are rejected as allegedly unpatentable over the same references as in the rejection above and further in view of Licha '570.

Applicants respectfully disagree for reasons of record. Nevertheless, data is submitted in the attached declaration demonstrating significant unexpected advantages with various conjugates according to the invention over the closest prior art, which is the conjugate of Neri. Please review the data and the discussion thereof in the last page of the declaration.

In view of the data, and further to the previously made arguments, reconsideration is respectfully and courteously requested.

Double Patenting Rejections

A terminal disclaimer is filed herewith over 11/185,025 rendering the rejection moot.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Csaba Henter/

Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908
Anthony J. Zelano, Reg. No. 27,969
Attorneys for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO &
BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: SCH-1869

Date: July 19, 2007

K:\Sch\1000 to 1999\1869\ReplyJul 07.doc